RECEIVED 20 2006 10:37

JUL 2 0 2006

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form Application No. 10/738,426 First Named Applicant: Anthony J. Baerlocher Examiner: Sumit Pandva Docket No: 112300-1819 Tentative Participants: (1) Adam H. Masia (2) Inson Skaarup (3) Sumit Pandva (4) Iohn Hotaling Proposed Date of Interview: July 20, 2006 Proposed Time: 3:00 (AM/PM) Eastern Time Type of Interview Requested: (1) (X Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO Issues To Be Discussed Issues Claims/ (Rei-Obj., etc) Fig. #s (1) Reiccion 1.2.4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] (2) Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy. Plinko and Dietz [] [] (2) Reference on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,833). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568). Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,833). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments arguments wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568). Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to present arguments wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants seek claim fication as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko. An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on		An-	Organic for the theology was	PTOL-413A	(05-03)
Application No. 10/738,426 Examiner: Sunit Pandva Docket No: 112300-1819 Tentative Participants: (1) Adam H. Masia (2) Jason Skaarup (4) John Hotaling Proposed Date of Interview: July 20, 2006 Proposed Time:	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			Avery: Out 0031-00	
Examiner: Sunit Pandya	Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form	•			
Examiner: Sunit Pandya	Application No. 10/738,426 First Named As	mlicant: Anthony I D			
Tentative Participants: (1) Adam H. Masia (2) Jason Skaarup (3) Sunt Pandya (4) John Hotaling Proposed Date of Interview: July 20, 2006 Proposed Time:	Examiner: Sunit Pandya Art Unit: 3714	Status of A	acriocher Pendi		
(1) Adam H. Masía (2) Jason Skaarup. (3) Sunit Pandya (4) John Hotaling Proposed Date of Interview: July 20, 2006 Proposed Time: 3:00 (AM/PM) Eastern Time Type of Interview Requested: (1) [X Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO Issues To Be Discussed Issues Claims/ Prior Discussed Agreed Not Agreed (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s Art (1) Rejection 1.2. 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] [] (2) Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy. Plinko and Dietz [] [] [] [] [] (2) Rejection of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being umpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	Docket No: <u>112300-1819</u>	Daries (I A	ppication. <u>Fenci</u>		
Continuation Sheet Attached Cont					
Proposed Date of Interview: July 20, 2006 Proposed Time: 3:00 (AM/PM) Eastern Time Type of Interview Requested: (1) [X Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO If yes, provide brief description: ISSUES TO Be Discussed ISSUES TO Be Discussed ISSUES To Be Discussed Agreed Not Agreed (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s Art (1) Rejection 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] [] (2) Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy, Plinko and Dietz [] [] [] [] Continuation Sheet Attached Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not trach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.				•	•
Type of Interview Requested: (1) [X Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO Issues To Be Discussed Issues Claims/ Prior Discussed Agreed Not Agreed (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s Art (1) Rejection 1. 2. 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] (2) Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy. Plinko and Dietz [] [] (2) Refection of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiezed on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	(3) Sumt Pandya (4) John Hotal	ing	<u>·</u>		
Type of Interview Requested: (1) [X Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated; [] YES	Proposed Date of Interview: <u>July 20, 2006</u>	Proposed	Time: <u>3:00</u> (2	4M/PM) East	ern Time
[X] Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated; [] YES [X] NO If yes, provide brief description: Issues To Be Discussed Issues To Be Discussed	Type of Interview Requested:				,
Issues To Be Discussed Issues To Be Discussed Issues To Be Discussed Issues Issues	745 A TO TOTAL S	Personal	(3) [] Video (Conference	
Issues Claims/ Prior Discussed Agreed Not Agreed (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s Art (1) Rejection 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] (2) Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy. Plinko and Dietz [] [] [] [] Continuation Sheet Attached Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.		[X]NO	•		
Issues Claims/ Prior Discussed Agreed Not Agreed (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s Art (1) Rejection 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] (2) Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy. Plinko and Dietz [] [] [] [] [] Continuation Sheet Attached Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	it yes, provide brief description:		•		 .
(1) Rejection 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []	Issues T	o Be Discussed		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
(i) Rejection 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-38 Tracy and Plinko [] [] [] [] (2) Rejection 5 and 21 Tracy. Plinko and Dietz [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []	Issues Claims/	Prior	Discussed	Agreed	· Not Amond
[2] Rejection 3 and 21 Tracy, Plinko and Dietz [1] [1] [1] [1] [1] [1] [1] [1] [1] [1]		Art		rigi ccu	not agreeu
[] Continuation Sheet Attached Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.			_ []	[]	[]
Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicants submit that Claims 1-38 are patentable over Tracy (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,568), Plinko (Premiezed on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	(2) <u>Rejection</u> 3 and 21	Tracy, Plinko and Die		[]	ĨĴ
6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	[] Continuation Sheet Attached				
6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 1983) and Dietz (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,835). Applicants wish to discuss claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicant	ts submit that Claims 1	-38 are patentable	over Tracy (L)	S. Patent No.
claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Applicants wish to present arguments why (1) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz cannot be properly combined for a Section 103 rejection and (2) Tracy, Plinko and Dietz, whether analyzed alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	6,296,568), Plinko (Premiered on TV Show Price is Right 198	3) and Dietz (U.S. Pate	ant No. 5.704.835)	Amplicants u	rish to diomice
do not teach the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants seek clarification as to which claims are rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	claims 1-38 in view of the cited references. Specifically, Appl	licants wish to present a	arguments why (1)	Tracy Plinko	and Dietz
being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	do not take the element invention. Additionally, Amiliante	2) Tracy, Plinko and Di	ictz, whether analy	zed alone or i	n combination,
An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on	being unpatentable over Tracy in view of Plinko.	seek ciailication as to v	which claims are re	ejected under t	Section 103 as
All litter view was conducted on the above-identified application of	An interview was conducted on the above identified annie	estion on			
	An incivity was conducted on the above-identified applic				
NOTE:	NOTE:				
This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01). This application will		miner in advance of the ir	nterview (see MPEP	8 713 013 Thi	Ilim noireailnes
not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.	not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a w	ritten record of this interv	riew. Therefore, appl	icant is advised	to file a statement
of the substance of this interview (57 Cere 1.135(6)) as soon as possible.	of the substance of this interview (57 Cere 1.155(0)) as soon as possi-	oje.			
Adam H. Masia (Reg. No. 35,602)	Adam H. Masia (Reg. No. 35,602)	٠			
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature) (Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)			(aminer/CDF C	Signature)
		•			_ , ,
This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.153. The information is required to obtain or rotain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USFTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application from to the USFTO. Time will very depending upon the bedwheld east Any comments on the sentent of time you require to complete this form eastfor suggestions for reducing this burden, abound to sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS	35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CPR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, inclining a individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or access	subering, prepeting, and submitting the load for reducing this burden, should be	file (and by the USPTO to process completed application from to sent to the Chief Information	cas) en application. Com to the USPTO. Time will Officer, U.S. Patent an	rfidentiality is governed by Il vory depending upon the d Tradomark Office, U.S.

ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Fax Message From:

Jul 20 2006 10:36

Name: BELL BOYD & LLOYD LLC Fax Number: 3128278000

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 2 0 2006

PAGE 1/3 * RCVD AT 7/20/2006 11:34:50 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/11 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:3128278000 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-08

BELL, BOYD & LLOYDILG

IP Department P.O. Box 1135 Chleago, Illinois 60690-1135 USA

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER 312-372-1121 312-827-8185 FAX

JUL 2 0 2006

Visit our web site at www.bellboyd.com

FAX COVER SHEET

Date Total Number of Pages		July 20, 2006 2 (Including this page)					
From		Adam H. Masia	•				
Phone Direct Fax		312-807-4284 312-827-8125					
Client/Matter Number		0112300-01819					

Message

If this transmission is incomplete, please call 312-558-6294.

This document is intended only for the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any use, dissemination or copying of this communication other than by the addressee is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original facsimile to us by mail.

If this communication contains advice with respect to a Federal tax matter, in accordance with the Treasury Department's Circular 230 such advice is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding any Federal tax penalties.

Thank you.